

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of September 30, 2009, claims 1-11 were rejected. Claims 12-24 were previously withdrawn and remain withdrawn.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bianco et al.* (US 6,256,737). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites a service distribution device configured to receive various services from a service provider under the control of a service registration server when the service distribution device is registered with the service registration server.

This is clearly unlike *Bianco* which fails to disclose or even fairly suggest a service distribution device configured to receive various services from a service provider under the control of a service registration server when the service distribution device is registered with the service registration server. Instead, *Bianco* merely discloses storing biometric templates and authentication certificates in a hierarchical manner on a server located in a corporate office or on a server located at a local office. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,737, Col. 3, l. 33-40. This cannot be fairly viewed as receiving various services from a service provider when a service distribution device is registered in a service registration server because *Bianco* merely discloses storing biometric data along with authentication certificates without disclosing registration of devices with a registration unit or receiving services.

As the Applicant's specification teaches, by providing a service distribution device configured to receive various services from a service provider under the control of a service registration server when the service distribution device is registered with the service registration server, authentication of a registered service provider is not required for every transaction. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0026427, Para. [0539]-[0541].

Therefore, because *Bianco* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 cannot stand. Because claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 1, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000